



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,050	02/12/2002	Simon Charles Gilligan	82377	2434

20529 7590 02/26/2003

NATH & ASSOCIATES
1030 15th STREET
6TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KHIEM M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073050

Applicant(s)

C-ILLIGAN

Examiner

R. V. GAYEN

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), in which event, a reply will be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned priority term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11: 453 O.G. 213.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in application.
- ☐ The following certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))
- ☐ Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moulin in view of Gunay et al. (6,179,658) and Murayama (6,325,670).

Moulin discloses the claimed optical fibre connector comprising a housing and an internal core member 17 defining a channel means for receiving an optical fibre. It is noted that Moulin lacks chamber with gel adhesive with plunger means for forcing the gel adhesive for sealing of the optical fibre. Gunay et al. discloses connector provided with gel adhesive chamber 224 and

Art Unit:

plunger means 222 for forcing the gel adhesive for sealing of conductor 14. Murayama also discloses connector provided with chamber gel adhesive 41 and plunger means 43.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide chamber with gel adhesive and plunger means for Moulin optical fibre connector for sealing of his optical fiber in view of the teachings of Gunay et al. and Murayama. The use of gel adhesive is old and well known in the art for sealing of optical fiber connector and the use of plunger means would facilitate its application.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Khiem Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1738 .


KHIEM NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

K.N.

February 24, 2003